REMARKS

The examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being "incomplete". The examiner's position is that without referring to the station in the steps of the method it is not clear that the steps are meant to describe a method of operating a station. This is not a reasonable interpretation of the claim, which clearly refers to what is claimed as "a method of operating a station". But to satisfy the examiner, and move the application along, we have added references to the station to each of the steps of the claim. This amendment is absolutely not required for patentability under 35 USC 112.

The examiner has withdrawn the anticipation rejection over Gleeson made in the first action, and substituted a new anticipation rejection based on Brock (US 6510156). The independent claims (1 and 4) are now rejected as anticipated by a portion of Brock (col. 10, line 47 to col. 11, line 6, and Fig. 2b). The examiner is urged to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

The invention has to do with the method by which a station receiving a transmission (the first transmission) notifies the station that sent the transmission of the fact that it was received. The prior art would typically do that by sending a response containing the destination address of the station. But the invention takes a different approach. Instead of sending a response containing the destination address, the invention sends a response (or more precisely, a "second transmission") that is sufficiently unique to the first transmission that the original transmitter will recognize the second transmission as a response. The station simply forms a second transmission that uses some information from the first transmission, enough that the second transmission is sufficiently unique to the first transmission, but with use of fewer bits than the destination address of the first transmission. By making the second transmission have this unique character, the transmitter that sent the first transmission can tell that the second transmission is a response to the first transmission.

Brock, like the examiner's prior reference, Gleeson, does teach reducing the size of a data packet, but that is where the similarity with the invention ends. Brock and Gleeson teach shortening the size of data packets ('cells") by replacing header information with a code that

represents the missing header information. In Brock that code is a single byte in size, and known as Header Error Control (HEC) code. The relationship between the code and the missing header information is conveyed separately to other stations, which upon receipt replace the code with the missing header information.

But the data packets shortened in the way taught by Brock and Gleeson do not meet the following language of claims 1 and 4:

> transmitting on the transmission medium at the station a second frame transmission including information from the first frame transmission other than the destination address, the information from the first frame transmission occupying fewer bits than the destination address but being sufficiently unique to the first frame transmission as to convey that the second frame transmission is a response to the first frame transmission.

The shortened data packets of Brock and Gleeson are not intended as response packets to indicate to a transmitting station that data (the 'first frame transmission") has been received. Thus, the packets of Brock and Gleeson do not contain "information from a first frame transmission." And thus the shortened packets of Brock and Gleeson also do not contain information that is "sufficiently unique to a first frame transmission as to convey that the second frame transmission [data packet] is a response to the first frame transmission."

So in two important respects, neither Brock nor Gleeson teach the invention of claims 1 and 4.

First, neither Brock nor Gleeson are concerned with providing a shortened response packet, which serves to tell a transmitting station that its packet has been received. The references discuss how packets should be formed and coded, but say nothing in particular about how response packets should be formed.

Second, neither Brock nor Gleeson teach anything about making a transmitted data packet ("second frame transmission") sufficiently unique to another data packet ("first frame transmission") as to convey that the second frame transmission is a response to the first frame transmission. Brock and Gleeson teach codes that represent header information, but those codes

bear no relationship to information in another data packet, let alone a sufficient uniqueness to information in another data packet.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 4 are allowable over the art of record.

The remaining claims are all properly dependent on claims 1 and 4, and thus allowable therewith. Each of the dependent claims adds one or more further limitations that enhance patentability, but those limitations are not presently relied upon. For that reason, and not because applicants agree with the examiner, no rebuttal is offered to the examiner's reasons for rejecting the dependent claims.

Allowance of the application is requested.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/29/2007

/grogerlee/
G. Roger Lee
Reg. No. 28,963

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906